

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7 are amended; and Claims 8-10 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment. Claims 1-7 are amended to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter and address minor informalities and claim rejections cited in the outstanding Official Action. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claim 1 was objected to because of a minor informality; Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite; and Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hall et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,852,571, hereinafter “Hall”).

Claim 1 was objected to because “a comma seems to be missing from line 8, rendering the claim confusing.” In response, the cited portion of Claim 1 is separated into two paragraphs separated by a semicolon to clarify that the input is configured to receive information from both a first information processing apparatus and a second information processing apparatus.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the limitation “said first information processing apparatus identification information” at lines 6-7 failed to have proper antecedent basis. In response, this feature has been amended to recite “first information processing apparatus identification information”, to clarify that this is the first recitation of this claimed feature.

Further, the Official Action cites “a second information processing apparatus” in lines 8-9 and 11 of Claim 1 as being unclear regarding whether “these are meant to be the same

apparatus". As is clearly recited in the claims, the claimed information processing apparatus exchanges information with both a first information processing apparatus and a second information processing apparatus. Accordingly, the recited "second information processing apparatus" as claimed, is clearly distinguished from the "first information processing apparatus".

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim 4 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the limitation "said information processing apparatus" is unclear whether it is referring to the first or second processing apparatus. In response, Claim 4 is amended to specifically recite that the information processing apparatus being referred to is the claimed information processing apparatus and neither the first or second information processing apparatus.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The outstanding Official Action asserts that Hall teaches all the elements of independent Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 states novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by Hall.

Amended Claim 1 relates to a device for generating customer identification information anonymously. Specifically, offer information is extended by a merchant over communication link, and such information may elicit a response from a customer who has received the offer. Responding to such an offer typically requires for a customer to submit personal information to a server or another device to participate in the received offer. Thus, the present inventors identified a need to automate a procedure for transmitting profile information while maintaining a specified level of anonymity to the customer.

Specifically, Claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus that receives content identification information and device identification information from a first information processing apparatus and device identification from a second information processing apparatus. A validity judgment is then formed based on the identification information corresponding to each of the first and second information processing devices. A customer identification information identifying a customer is then assigned to the second information processing apparatus identification information. The customer identification information is then output as information for receiving a presented content identified by said content identification information.

Turning to the applied reference, Hall describes a basic system for transferring funds between a customer's account and a transferee's account.¹ In Hall, an identification card is provided at a point-of-sale input terminal and the input terminal transmits a retail merchant identifier, customer identifier and transaction amount to a central location over a communication link.² A computer at the central location then determines whether there are sufficient funds in the customer's account to commence the requested transaction and transmits an acknowledgement back to the point-of-sale input terminal indicating the result of this determination. Thus, Hall describes a basic debit card or credit card system for use in purchases.

In contrast, amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia* an information processing apparatus, comprising:

“an input configured to receive from a first information processing apparatus content identification information... and first information processing apparatus identification information...

the input further configured to receive from a second information processing apparatus, second information

¹ Hall, at Abstract.

² Hall at col. 16, lines 22-40.

processing apparatus identification information identifying a second information processing apparatus...”

Hall describes that identification information is received at the central location from only a single information processing apparatus. As discussed at col. 16, lines 36-40 of Hall, information is transmitted from the point-of-sale input terminal to the central location via a communication link. However, Hall fails to teach or suggest that the central location includes an input configured to receive identification information from *first and second* information processing apparatuses, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Further, Hall describes that identification information corresponding to only the identity of the retail merchant, the customer, and the amount to be transferred is sent from the input terminal to the central location. None of this information corresponds to *identification information identifying an information processing apparatus*, as recited in amended Claim 1. Instead, the received information corresponds only to data relevant to the transaction being performed between the input terminal and the central location.

Further, amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

“...a validity judgment means for forming a judgment on validity of said content identification information, said first information processing apparatus identification information and said information processing apparatus identification information...”

As discussed above, Hall fails to teach or suggest that information is received corresponding to the identity of the first and second information processing apparatus. Further, Hall fails to teach or suggest that a validity judgment is formed based on *any* of the information exchanged between the point-of-sale input terminal and the central location.

Hall simply describes that the amount of credit available in the customer’s account is compared against the transferred amount in order to determine if the customer is able to make a requested purchase. Thus, Hall determines if a transaction is authorized, but fails to teach

or suggest, at any point, a validity judgment means *forming a judgment on validity* of content information and identification information received from two different information processing devices, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Further, amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

“...an information assignment means for assigning customer identification information identifying a customer to said second information processing apparatus identification information.”

In addressing this claimed feature, the Official Action cites col. 16, lines 55-62 of Hall. This cited portion of Hall describes that a printer connected to the point-of-sale input terminal produces a hard copy receipt of a transaction with a consumer. Hall does not describe, at any point, that identification information is *assigned* to and information processing apparatus whatsoever. Thus, Hall fails to teach or suggest that *customer identification information identifying a customer is assigned to a second information processing apparatus*, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Instead, Hall simply describes that the result of the point-of-sale transaction is printed at the input terminal.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. For substantially the same reasons given with respect to amended Claim 1, it is also submitted that amended independent Claims 6 and 7 patentably define over Hall.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-7 is definite and patentably distinguishing over the applied reference. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
ATH:smi

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\20'S\205018-US\205018US-AM.DOC